Qualcom

Hard and Soft equivariance priors via Steerable CNNs

Gabriele Cesa

Qualcomm AI Research*

University of Amsterdam, AMLab

04/09/2024



Hard and Soft equivariance priors via Steerable CNNs

First, due credit to my amazing collaborators!







Maurice Weiler* and Gabriele Cesa*. General E(2)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs, Neural Information Processing Systems, 2019

Gabriele Cesa, Leon Lang, Maurice Weiler, A Program to build E(n)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs, *International Conference on Representation Learning*, 2022

Maksim Zhdanov, Nico Hoffmann, Gabriele Cesa, Implicit Convolutional Kernels for Steerable CNNs. *Neural Information Processing Systems, 2023*

Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. International Conference 2 on Machine Learning. 2024

Agenda

From Group Convolution to Steerable Filters

Steerable Fields and Representation Theory

Steerable CNNs

Hard Priors: solving the exact kernel constraint

Soft Priors: learnable kernel constraint

Equivariance: CNN (rotation equivariance?)



Convolution: $(\mathbb{R}^n, +)$ - equivariance





Group Convolution: $(\mathbb{R}^n, +) \rtimes C_4$ - equivariance



Taco S. Cohen and Max Welling, Group Equivariant Convolutional Networks, International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), 2016

Group Convolution (lifting convolution): $(\mathbb{R}^n, +) \rtimes C_4$ - equivariance



Taco S. Cohen and Max Welling, Group Equivariant Convolutional Networks, International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), 2016

Group Convolution



Taco S. Cohen and Max Welling, Group Equivariant Convolutional Networks, International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), 2016

Group Convolution: Challenges

$$[\kappa \star f](g) = \int_{x \in X} \kappa(g^{-1} x) f(x) d\mu(x)$$



- Often some form of discretization is required (potential artifacts!)
- What if input or output are not in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ or $L^2(G)$?
 - e.g. vector fields?
- The group G might be infinite or too large to fully enumerate
 - G = SO(3) rotations of a point cloud
 - *n*! permutations of a set or nodes of a graph

Group Convolution

 $[\kappa \star \cdot]: L^2(\mathbb{Z}^2) \to L^2((\mathbb{Z}^2, +) \rtimes C_4)$



Isotropic Filters $[\kappa \star \cdot]: L^2(\mathbb{Z}^2) \to L^2(\mathbb{Z}^2)$

• Isotropic filters: the response does not change when rotated



- Not very expressive
- Analogous to Graph Message Passing: no directional dependence!



• Filter can be rotated via linear combination

$$[\mathbf{R}_{\theta}.\kappa](r,\phi) = \kappa(r,\phi-\theta)$$

= w(r) cos(\phi + \beta - \theta)
= w(r) cos(\phi + \beta) cos\theta - w(r) sin(\phi + \beta) sin\theta
= cos\theta \kappa(r,\phi) - sin\theta \kappa(r,\phi-\frac{\pi}{2})
= cos\theta \kappa(r,\phi) - sin\theta \kappa_{\frac{\pi}{2}}.\kappa(r,\phi)

 $\kappa(r,\phi) = w(r)\cos(\phi + \beta)$

• e.g. filters used for edge-detection in classical Computer Vision

William T. Freeman and Edward H. Adelson. The design and use of steerable filters. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis & Machine Intelligence*, 1991

• Filter can be rotated via linear combination

Thanks to *linearity* of convolution operator:

$$R_{\theta}.\kappa \star f = \left(\cos\theta \kappa - \sin\theta R_{\overline{n}}.\kappa\right) \star f$$
$$= \cos\theta \left(\kappa \star f\right) - \sin\theta \left(R_{\overline{n}}.\kappa \star f\right)$$



• Filter can be rotated via linear combination



$$R_{\theta}.\kappa \star f = \cos\theta \left(\kappa \star f\right) - \sin\theta \left(R_{\pi}.\kappa \star f\right)$$

• Filter can be rotated via linear combination

 $\rho(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix}$



$$R_{\theta}.\kappa \star f = \cos\theta \left(\kappa \star f\right) - \sin\theta \left(R_{\frac{\pi}{2}}.\kappa \star f\right)$$

Steerable Filters: Other examples

• Filter can be rotated via linear combination



Circular harmonics



 $D^{j}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{2j+1 \times 2j+1}$ Wigner D-matrix

Agenda

From Group Convolution to Steerable Filters

Steerable Fields and Representation Theory

Steerable CNNs

Hard Priors: solving the exact kernel constraint

Soft Priors: learnable kernel constraint

Feature Fields

- Interpret features as a multi-channels signal $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^d$
- Signal transforms under *(point) symmetry group G* according to a *transformation law*
 - symmetry group *G* : e.g. rotations or reflections
 - N.B.: before we used G to also indicate translations
 - For now, we will implicitly consider equivariance to $(\mathbb{R}^n, +) \rtimes G$



Feature Fields and Steerable CNNs

- Interpret features as a multi-channels signal $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^d$
- Signal transforms under *(point) symmetry group G* according to a *transformation law*
 - symmetry group *G* : e.g. rotations or reflections
- Type of transformation identified by a representation of $G \quad \rho: G \to \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$

$$[g.f](x) = \rho(g)f(g^{-1}x)$$

$$[\swarrow^{*} \star \bullet]: \mathbb{R}^{2} \to \mathbb{R}^{1} \qquad [\swarrow^{*} \star \bullet]: \mathbb{R}^{2} \to \mathbb{R}^{2}$$

Feature Fields and Steerable CNNs

- Interpret features as a multi-channels signal $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^d$
- Signal transforms under *(point) symmetry group G* according to a *transformation law*
 - symmetry group *G* : e.g. rotations or reflections
- Type of transformation identified by a representation of $G \quad \rho: G \to \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$

$$[g.f](x) = \rho(g)f(g^{-1}x)$$

$$f = \begin{bmatrix} & & & \\ & & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & & \\ & & \\ & & & \\$$

20

Definition: Representation of a Compact Group

A *(real) representation* $\rho: G \to GL(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of a *compact group* G is a map which associates to each element $g \in G$ an *invertible* $d \times d$ matrix s.t.:

- $\forall a, b \quad \rho(a)\rho(b) = \rho(ab)$
- $\forall a \ \rho(a)^{-1} = \rho(a^{-1})$
- $\rho(e) = \mathrm{Id}_{d \times d}$

Definition: Representation of a Compact Group

A *(real) representation* $\rho: G \to GL(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of a *compact group* G is a map which associates to each element $g \in G$ an *invertible* $d \times d$ matrix s.t.:

- $\forall a, b \quad \rho(a)\rho(b) = \rho(ab)$
- $\forall a \ \rho(a)^{-1} = \rho(a^{-1})$
- $\rho(e) = \mathrm{Id}_{d \times d}$

Can assume w.l.o.g. *orthogonal* representations, i.e. that $\rho(g)^{-1} = \rho(g)^T$

 $\rho(r_{\theta}) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{bmatrix}$

Describes the action of a group G on a vector space $V = \mathbb{R}^d$

E.g. representations of the rotation group SO(2)

• Trivial representation

 $\rho(r_{\theta}) = 1$

Standard representation

 $f(t,\cdot): \mathcal{C}_4 \to \mathbb{R}$





 $f(t, \theta)$





Peter-Weyl Theorem Coming Soon!





θ

Direct Sum



Formally: the Regular Representation

- $L^2(G)$ is the vector space of square integrable functions on G
- $L^2(G)$ carries an **orthogonal action** of G

 $g: L^{2}(G) \to L^{2}(G), \qquad f \mapsto g.f$ $[g.f](x) \coloneqq f(g^{-1}x)$

• This is the *Regular Representation* of *G*

Formally: the Regular Representation

- $L^2(G)$ is the vector space of square integrable functions on G
- $L^2(G)$ carries an **orthogonal action** of G

 $g: L^{2}(G) \to L^{2}(G), \qquad f \mapsto g.f$ $[g.f](x) \coloneqq f(g^{-1}x)$

- This is the *Regular Representation* of *G*
- When G is a finite group it looks like permutation matrices (e.g. C_4)

$$\rho(r^{0}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \rho(r^{1}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \rho(r^{2}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \rho(r^{3}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

One Theorem To Rule Them All: Peter-Weyl theorem

- Let G be a compact group
- There is a set of *irreducible representations (irreps)* denoted \hat{G}
 - analogous to frequencies in classical Fourier Transform
 - e.g. circular harmonics or Wigner-D Matrices

Fourier Transfor The matrix coefficients of the *irreps* form an *orthogonal basis* for $L^2(G)$

$$f(\boldsymbol{g}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}} \sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}} \sum_{1 \le ij \le d_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}} \widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{\psi})_{ij} \boldsymbol{\psi}(\boldsymbol{g})_{ij}$$

$$\psi_{0}(\theta) = 1 \quad \psi_{1}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos 1\theta & -\sin 1\theta \\ \sin 1\theta & \cos 1\theta \end{bmatrix} \quad \psi_{2}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos 2\theta & -\sin 2\theta \\ \sin 2\theta & \cos 2\theta \end{bmatrix} \quad \psi_{3}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos 3\theta & -\sin 3\theta \\ \sin 3\theta & \cos 3\theta \end{bmatrix}$$

One Theorem To Rule Them All: Peter-Weyl theorem

- Let G be a compact group
- There is a set of *irreducible representations (irreps)* denoted \hat{G}
 - analogous to frequencies in classical Fourier Transform
 - e.g. circular harmonics or Wigner-D Matrices

Fourier Transfor The matrix coefficients of the *irreps* form an *orthogonal basis* for $L^2(G)$

$$f(\boldsymbol{g}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}} \sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}} \sum_{1 \le ij \le d_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}} \widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{\psi})_{ij} \boldsymbol{\psi}(\boldsymbol{g})_{ij}$$

 $\hat{f}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \times d_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}$ Contains the weights

One Theorem To Rule Them All: Peter-Weyl theorem

- Let G be a compact group
- There is a set of *irreducible representations (irreps)* denoted \hat{G}
 - analogous to frequencies in classical Fourier Transform
 - e.g. circular harmonics or Wigner-D Matrices

The matrix coefficients of the *irreps* form an *orthogonal basis* for $L^2(G)$

$$f(\boldsymbol{g}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{G}}} \sqrt{d_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}} \sum_{1 \le ij \le d_{\boldsymbol{\psi}}} \widehat{f}(\boldsymbol{\psi})_{ij} \boldsymbol{\psi}(\boldsymbol{g})_{ij}$$

Caveat: this is actually a basis only in \mathbb{C} , but sometimes it has redundant entries in \mathbb{R} , e.g.

$$\psi_{1}(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos 1\theta & -\sin 1\theta \\ \sin 1\theta & \cos 1\theta \end{bmatrix}$$

One Theorem To Rule Them All: Peter-Weyl theorem (Pt. 2)

- Let *G* be a *compact* group
- There is a set of *irreducible representations (irreps)* denoted \hat{G}
 - analogous to frequencies in classical Fourier Transform
 - e.g. circular harmonics or Wigner-D Matrices

Any unitary representation ρ can be decomposed as a *direct sum* of *irreps* up to a change of basis Q_{ρ}

$$\rho(\boldsymbol{g}) = Q_{\rho}^{T} \left(\bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_{i} \in \widehat{G}} \bigoplus_{r}^{[i(\rho)]} \boldsymbol{\psi}_{i}(\boldsymbol{g}) \right) Q_{\rho}$$

$$\rho(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & & \\ \cos 1\theta & -\sin 1\theta \\ \sin 1\theta & \cos 1\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \cos 2\theta & -\sin 2\theta \\ \sin 2\theta & \cos 2\theta \end{bmatrix}$$

What did we find?

- Group convolution with steerable filters produces smaller steerable features
 - No need to store redundant activations
- So far, only studied lifting convolution $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to L^2((\mathbb{R}^n, +) \rtimes G)$
 - Input is a scalar field
 - Recover lifting convolution when using output regular representation
- What about other input fields? Intermediate layers?



Agenda

From Group Convolution to Steerable Filters

Steerable Fields and Representation Theory

Steerable CNNs

Hard Priors: solving the exact kernel constraint

Soft Priors: learnable kernel constraint

Feature Fields and Steerable CNNs

- Symmetry group *G*
- An intermediate feature is a multi-channels signal $f_l: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^d$
- Associated with its own transformation law ρ_l
- Steerable CNN is equivariant when each layer Ψ_l commutes with its input and output transformations




Given a choice of input and output steerable feature types, what convolution do we need to use?

• What kind of filters produce an output feature map with the *desired transformation type*?



Steerable CNNs

• Standard *convolution* with *G*-steerable filter K guarantees also *G* equivariance

$$K: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times d_{in}}$$

$$K(x) = \rho_{out}(g) K(g^{-1}, x) \rho_{in}(g)^T$$

Maurice Weiler, Mario Geiger, Max Welling, Wouter Boomsma and Taco Cohen, 3D Steerable CNNs: Learning Rotationally Equivariant Features in Volumetric Data, *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS), 2018* Taco Cohen, Mario Geiger and Maurice Weiler, A General Theory of Equivariant CNNs on Homogeneous Spaces, *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2019*

Steerable CNNs

• Standard *convolution* with *G*-steerable filter *K* guarantees also *G* equivariance

$$K: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times d_{in}}$$

$$K(x) = \rho_{out}(g) K(g^{-1}, x) \rho_{in}(g)^T$$

Q: How do we parameterize *G*-steerable filters?

Equivariant Non-Linearities

- Let the intermediate feature $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^d$ transform under $\rho: G \to O(d)$
- The quantity $|f(x)|_2^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is invariant
 - norm non-linearity: $f(x) \mapsto \sigma(|f(x)|_2^2) f(x)$ (Worrall et al., 2017)
 - gated non-linearity: $f(x), f_g(x) \mapsto \sigma(f_g(x))f(x)$ (Weiler et al., 2018)
 - where $f_g(x)$ is another, invariant, feature field transforming under $\rho(g) = 1$
- Can also use other quadratic invariants:
 - **tensor-product**: $f(x) \mapsto f(x) \otimes f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ (Kondor et al., 2018)
 - output transforms under $\rho_{out} = \rho \otimes \rho$

- $(x, y, z) \otimes (x, y, z) = vec \begin{pmatrix} x^2 & xy & xz \\ xy & y^2 & yz \\ xz & yz & z^2 \end{pmatrix}$
- Fourier-based pointwise non-linearities (imitate GCNN)
 - feature vector $f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents a bandlimited signal in $L^2(G)$
 - Compose: (discrete) *Fourier Transform* σ (discrete) *Inverse Fourier Transform*
 - Band-limit + sufficient samples to control reconstruction error

Daniel E. Worrall, Stephan J. Garbin, Daniyar Turmukhambetov, and Gabriel J. Brostow. Harmonic networks: Deep translation and rotation equivariance. *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2017.* Maurice Weiler, Mario Geiger, Max Welling, Wouter Boomsma, and Taco S. Cohen. 3D steerable CNNs: Learning rotationally equivariant features in volumetric data. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2018 Risi Kondor, Zhen Lin, and Shubhendu Trivedi. Clebsch-gordan nets: a fully Fourier space spherical convolutional neural network. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2018. Nadav Dym, and Haggai Maron. On the Universality of Rotation Equivariant Point Cloud Networks. International Conference on Learning Representations (ICML). 2020.*

Outcome: equivariance to continuous rotations



Agenda

From Group Convolution to Steerable Filters

Steerable Fields and Representation Theory

Steerable CNNs

Hard Priors: solving the exact kernel constraint

Soft Priors: learnable kernel constraint

Solving the steerability constraint

• Standard *convolution* with *G*-steerable filter K guarantees also *G* equivariance

$$K: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times d_{in}}$$

$$K(x) = \rho_{out}(g) K(g^{-1}, x) \rho_{in}(g)^T$$

Q: How do we parameterize *G*-steerable filters?

Solving the steerability constraint: Overall Strategy

- 1. Linear projection Π : space of *unconstrained kernels* \mapsto space of *equivariant kernels*
- 2. Pick a convenient basis for the **domain** of Π : space of *unconstrained kernels*
- 3. Project to find a basis for the **image** of Π : space of *equivariant kernels*

$$K(x) = \rho_{out}(g)K(g^{-1}.x)\rho_{in}(g)^T$$

Solving the steerability constraint: **Projection**

• Linear projection Π : space of *unconstrained kernels* \mapsto space of *equivariant kernels*

$$K': \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times d_{in}} \qquad \longmapsto \qquad K = \Pi[K']: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times d_{in}}$$

$$K(x) = \rho_{out}(g)K(g^{-1}.x)\rho_{in}(g)^T$$

Solving the steerability constraint: **Reynolds Operator**

• Linear projection Π : space of *unconstrained kernels* \mapsto space of *equivariant kernels*

$$K': \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times d_{in}} \qquad \longmapsto \qquad K = \Pi[K']: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times d_{in}}$$

$$K(x) = \rho_{out}(g) K(g^{-1}.x) \rho_{in}(g)^{T}$$
$$\Pi[K'](x) = \int_{G} \rho_{out}(g) K'(g^{-1}.x) \rho_{in}(g)^{T} dg$$

Solving the steerability constraint: Kernel Vectorization

- Consider the vectorized kernel $\kappa(x) = vec(K(x))$
 - Column-wise vectorization of the matrix K(x)

 $\begin{aligned} & \text{Identity} \\ & \mathcal{V}ec(ABC^{T}) = (C \otimes A)\mathcal{V}ec(B) \\ & \text{Kronecker product} \\ & A \otimes B = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} \cdot B & \cdots & a_{1n} \cdot B \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} \cdot B & \cdots & a_{nn} \cdot B \end{pmatrix} \\ & \mathcal{P}in \otimes \mathcal{P}out : G \to \mathbb{R}(d_{out} \cdot d_{in}) \times (d_{out} \cdot d_{in}) \end{aligned}$



$$\kappa(x) = [(\rho_{in} \otimes \rho_{out})(g)]\kappa(g^{-1}.x)$$

 $\kappa: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \cdot d_{in}}$

$$\Pi[\kappa'](x) = \int_G (\rho_{in} \otimes \rho_{out})(g)\kappa'(g^{-1}.x) \, dg$$

Solving the steerability constraint: Steerable Basis

• Assume a *G*-steerable basis $\mathcal{B} = \{Y_j^k : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_j} \mid \psi_j \in \hat{G}, k\}$ for $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (Freeman & Adelson, 1991)

$$Y_{j}^{k}(g^{-1}.x) = \psi_{j}(g)^{T}Y_{j}^{k}(x)$$

• Expand *unconstrained kernel* with parameter matrices $W_{j,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \cdot d_{in} \times d_j}$

$$\kappa'(x) = \sum_{j,k} W_{j,k} Y_j^k(x)$$





Peter-Weyl Theorem $applied on L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ $\mathcal{B} forms the change of basis$

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\rho_{in} \otimes \rho_{out})(g) \kappa'(g^{-1}.x) dg$$
$$= \int_{G} (\rho_{in} \otimes \rho_{out})(g) \sum_{j,k} W_{j,k} Y_{j}^{k}(g^{-1}.x) dg$$

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\rho_{in} \otimes \rho_{out})(g) \kappa'(g^{-1}.x) dg$$
$$= \int_{G} (\rho_{in} \otimes \rho_{out})(g) \sum_{j,k} W_{j,k} \psi_j(g)^T Y_j^k(x) dg$$

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\rho_{in} \otimes \rho_{out})(g) \kappa'(g^{-1}.x) dg$$
$$= \sum_{j,k} \left[\int_{G} (\rho_{in} \otimes \rho_{out})(g) W_{j,k} \psi_{j}(g)^{T} dg \right] Y_{j}^{k}(x)$$

Solving the steerability constraint: Assume Irreps

• W.I.o.g. assume input and output representations are *irreducible representations*

• That is
$$ho_{out} = \psi_J$$
 and $ho_{in} = \psi_l$

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\psi_{l} \otimes \psi_{J})(g)\kappa'(g^{-1}.x) dg$$
$$= \sum_{j,k} unvec[Y_{j}^{k}(x)$$
$$\left[\int_{G} (\psi_{j} \otimes \psi_{l} \otimes \psi_{J})(g) dg \right] vec(W_{j,k})$$

Solving the steerability constraint: Decompose Tensor Products

• Tensor products can be decomposed as a direct sum of irreps via Clebsh-Gordan transform

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\psi_{l} \otimes \psi_{J})(g)\kappa'(g^{-1}.x) dg$$
$$= \sum_{j,k} unvec[] Y_{j}^{k}(x)$$
$$\left[\int_{G} (\psi_{j} \otimes \psi_{l} \otimes \psi_{J})(g) dg \right] vec(W_{j,k})$$

Leon Lang and Maurice Weiler. A Wigner-Eckart theorem for group equivariant convolution kernels. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020 Gabriele Cesa, Leon Lang, and Maurice Weiler. A program to build *E*(*N*)-equivariant steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021 Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2024 $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Peter-Weyl Theorem} \\ \textbf{Decompose } \psi_j \otimes \psi_l \otimes \psi_l \end{array}$

Solving the steerability constraint: Decompose Tensor Products

• Tensor products can be decomposed as a direct sum of irreps via Clebsh-Gordan transform

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\psi_{l} \otimes \psi_{j})(g)\kappa'(g^{-1}.x) dg$$
$$= \sum_{j,k} unvec[] Y_{j}^{k}(x)$$
$$\left[\int_{G} Q_{jlj}^{T} \left(\bigoplus_{i} \bigoplus_{r}^{[i(jlj)]} \psi_{i}(g) \right) Q_{jlj} dg \right] vec(W_{j,k})$$

Leon Lang and Maurice Weiler. A Wigner-Eckart theorem for group equivariant convolution kernels. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020 Gabriele Cesa, Leon Lang, and Maurice Weiler. A program to build *E*(*N*)-equivariant steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021 Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2024 $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Peter-Weyl Theorem} \\ \textbf{Decompose } \psi_j \otimes \psi_l \otimes \psi_l \end{array}$

Solving the steerability constraint: Decompose Tensor Products

• Tensor products can be decomposed as a direct sum of irreps via Clebsh-Gordan transform

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\psi_{l} \otimes \psi_{J})(g)\kappa'(g^{-1}.x) dg$$
$$= \sum_{j,k} unvec[\quad]Y_{j}^{k}(x)$$
$$Q_{jlJ}^{T} \left(\bigoplus_{i} \bigoplus_{r}^{[i(jU)]} \left[\int_{G} \psi_{i}(g) dg\right]\right) Q_{jlJ} vec(W_{j,k})$$

Leon Lang and Maurice Weiler. A Wigner-Eckart theorem for group equivariant convolution kernels. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020 Gabriele Cesa, Leon Lang, and Maurice Weiler. A program to build *E*(*N*)-equivariant steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021 Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2024

Solving the steerability constraint: Recall Fourier Transform

• The matrix coefficients of the *irreducible representations* form an *orthogonal basis*

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\psi_{l} \otimes \psi_{j})(g)\kappa'(g^{-1}.x) dg$$
$$= \sum_{j,k} unvec[] Y_{j}^{k}(x)$$
$$Q_{jlj}^{T} \left(\bigoplus_{i} \bigoplus_{r}^{[i(jlj)]} \left[\int_{G} \psi_{i}(g)\psi_{0}(g) dg \right] \right) Q_{jlj} vec(W_{j,k})$$

Leon Lang and Maurice Weiler. A Wigner-Eckart theorem for group equivariant convolution kernels. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020 Gabriele Cesa, Leon Lang, and Maurice Weiler. A program to build *E*(*N*)-equivariant steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021 Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2024

Solving the steerability constraint: Recall Fourier Transform

• The matrix coefficients of the *irreducible representations* form an *orthogonal basis*

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\psi_{l} \otimes \psi_{j})(g)\kappa'(g^{-1}.x) dg$$
$$= \sum_{j,k} unvec[] Y_{j}^{k}(x)$$
$$Q_{jlj}^{T} \left(\bigoplus_{i} \bigcup_{r}^{[i(jlj)]} \delta_{i=0} \right) Q_{jlj} vec(W_{j,k})$$

Leon Lang and Maurice Weiler. A Wigner-Eckart theorem for group equivariant convolution kernels. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020 Gabriele Cesa, Leon Lang, and Maurice Weiler. A program to build *E*(*N*)-equivariant steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2021 Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2024 Peter-Weyl Theorem Orthogonality matrix coefficients of the irreps

Solving the steerability constraint: Sparse Subset of Weights

• The matrix coefficients of the *irreducible representations* form an *orthogonal basis*

Leon Lang and Maurice Weiler. A Wigner-Eckart theorem for group equivariant convolution kernels. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020 Gabriele Cesa, Leon Lang, and Maurice Weiler. A program to build *E*(*N*)-equivariant steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Learning Representations*. *2021* Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Machine Learning*. *2024*

Result

- Complete theoretical description of the space of *G*-steerable filters
 - For any compact G and any transformation laws ho_{in} , ho_{out}
- Algorithm to explicitly construct the steerable convolution layers
- General implementation in the form of a *PyTorch library:*

github.com/QUVA-Lab/escnn





General Program to implement *G*-equivariance: 2D images

2D rotational symmetries

 $(\mathbb{R}^2, +) \rtimes \mathbf{G} < E(2)$

Maurice Weiler* and Gabriele Cesa*. General E(2)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs, *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2019*

group	representation		nonlinearity	invariant map	citation	MNISTO(2)	MNIST rot	MNIST 12k
$1 = \{e\}$	(conventional C	NN)	ELU	-	-	5.53 ± 0.20	2.87 ± 0.09	0.91 ± 0.06
$2 - C_1 - C_1$					[7, 9]	5.19 ± 0.08	2.48 ± 0.13	0.82 ± 0.01
3 C ₂					[7, 9]	3.29 ± 0.07	1.32 ± 0.02	0.87 ± 0.04
4 C ₃					-	2.87 ± 0.04	1.19 ± 0.06	0.80 ± 0.03
5 C ₄				[6	6, 1, 7, 9, 10]	2.40 ± 0.05	1.02 ± 0.03	0.99 ± 0.03
6 C ₆	regular	ρ_{reg}	ELU	G-pooling	[8]	2.08 ± 0.03	0.89 ± 0.03	0.84 ± 0.02
$\tau = C_8$					[7, 9]	1.96 ± 0.04	0.84 ± 0.02	0.89 ± 0.03
8 C ₁₂					[7]	1.95 ± 0.07	0.80 ± 0.03	0.89 ± 0.03
9 C ₁₆					[7, 9]	1.93 ± 0.04	0.82 ± 0.02	0.95 ± 0.04
$10 \underline{C_{20}}$					[7]	1.95 ± 0.05	0.83 ± 0.05	0.94 ± 0.06
$n = C_4 =$		$5\rho_{reg} \oplus 2\rho_{quot}^{C_4/C_2} \oplus 3\psi_0$			[1]	2.43 ± 0.05	1.03 ± 0.05	1.01 ± 0.03
12 C_8		$5\rho_{reg} \oplus 2\rho_{quot}^{C_6/C_2} \oplus 2\rho_{quot}^{C_6/C_3} \oplus 2\psi_0$			-	2.03 ± 0.05	0.84 ± 0.05	0.91 ± 0.02
$\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{C}_{12}$	quotient	$5\rho_{reg} \oplus 2\rho_{quot}^{C_8/C_2} \oplus 2\rho_{quot}^{C_8/C_4} \oplus 2\psi_0$			-	2.04 ± 0.04	0.81 ± 0.02	0.95 ± 0.02
$14 - C_{16}$		$5\rho_{reg} \oplus 2\rho_{quot}^{C_{12}/C_2} \oplus 2\rho_{quot}^{C_{12}/C_4} \oplus 3\psi_0$			-	2.00 ± 0.01	0.86 ± 0.04	0.98 ± 0.04
15 C_{20}		$5\rho_{reg} \oplus 2\rho_{quot}^{C_{16}/C_2} \oplus 2\rho_{quot}^{C_{16}/C_4} \oplus 4\psi_0$			-	2.01 ± 0.05	0.83 ± 0.03	0.96 ± 0.04
16	regular/scalar	$\psi_0 \xrightarrow{\text{conv}} \rho_{\text{reg}} \xrightarrow{G\text{-pool}} \psi_0$	ELU, G-pooling		[6, 25]	2.02 ± 0.02	0.90 ± 0.03	0.93 ± 0.04
17 C16	regular/vector	$\psi_1 \xrightarrow{\text{conv}} \rho_{\text{reg}} \xrightarrow{\text{vector pool}} \psi_1$	vector field		[13, 26]	2.12 ± 0.02	1.07 ± 0.03	0.78 ± 0.03
- 10	mixed vector	$\rho_{\text{reg}} \oplus \psi_1 \xrightarrow{\text{conv}} 2\rho_{\text{reg}} \xrightarrow{\text{vector}} \rho_{\text{reg}} \oplus \psi_1$	ELU, vector field		-	1.87 ± 0.03	0.83 ± 0.02	0.63 ± 0.02
		$preg \oplus pri $ $preg \oplus pri $				0.40	0.44	0.0010.02
19 D ₁					-	3.40 ± 0.07	3.44 ± 0.10	0.98 ± 0.03
20 D ₂					-	2.42 ± 0.07 0.17	2.39 ± 0.04 0.15	1.05 ± 0.03
21 D ₃					-	2.17 ± 0.06	2.15 ± 0.05	0.94 ± 0.02
22 D ₄	rogular		ELU	C pooling	[0, 1, 27]	1.88 ± 0.04	1.87 ± 0.04	1.09 ± 0.03
23 D ₆	regular	ρ _{reg}	ELU	G-pooling	[8]	1.77 ± 0.06	1.77 ± 0.04	1.00 ± 0.03
24 D8					-	1.68 ± 0.06	1.73 ± 0.03 1.65 ± 0.03	1.04 ± 0.02 1.67 + 5.52
25 D ₁₂					-	1.00 ± 0.05	1.00 ± 0.05 1.05	1.07 ± 0.01
26 D ₁₆					-	1.62 ± 0.04	1.00 ± 0.02 1.69 ± 0.02	1.08 ± 0.04
27 D ₂₀		. conv G-pool			-	1.04 ± 0.06	1.02 ± 0.05	1.09 ± 0.03
28 D ₁₆	regular/scalar	$\psi_{0,0} \longrightarrow \rho_{reg} \longrightarrow \psi_{0,0}$	ELU, G-pooling		-	1.92 ± 0.03	1.88 ± 0.07	1.74 ± 0.04
29	irreps ≤ 1	$\bigoplus_{i=0}^{i} \psi_i$			-	2.98 ± 0.04	1.38 ± 0.09	1.29 ± 0.05
30	irreps ≤ 3	$\bigoplus_{i=0}^{c} \psi_i$			-	3.02 ± 0.18	1.38 ± 0.09	1.27 ± 0.03
31	irreps ≤ 5	$\bigoplus_{i=0}^{i} \psi_i$			-	3.24 ± 0.05	1.44 ± 0.10	1.36 ± 0.04
32	irreps ≤ 7	$\bigoplus_{i=0}^{i} \psi_i$	ELU, norm-ReLU	conv2triv	-	3.30 ± 0.11	1.51 ± 0.10	1.40 ± 0.07
33	\mathbb{C} -irreps ≤ 1	$\bigoplus_{i=0} \psi_i^{\varepsilon}$			[12]	3.39 ± 0.10	1.47 ± 0.06	1.42 ± 0.04
34	\mathbb{C} -irreps ≤ 3	$\bigoplus_{i=0}^{-} \psi_i^{\varepsilon}$			[12]	3.48 ± 0.16	1.51 ± 0.05	1.53 ± 0.07
35	\mathbb{C} -irreps ≤ 5	$\bigoplus_{i=0}^{i} \psi_i^{\circ}$			-	3.59 ± 0.08	1.59 ± 0.05	1.55 ± 0.06
36 SO(2)	\bigcirc -irreps ≤ 7	$\bigoplus_{i=0} \psi_i^{\omega}$	ELU I		-	3.04 ± 0.12	1.01 ± 0.06	1.02 ± 0.03
37			ELU, squasn		-	3.10 ± 0.09	1.41 ± 0.04	1.40 ± 0.05
38			ELU, norm-ReLU	0.000	-	3.23 ± 0.08	1.38 ± 0.08	1.33 ± 0.03
59			shared norm Bal U	norm	-	2.00 ± 0.11 2.61 ± 0.00	1.10 ± 0.06 1.57 + 0.07	1.10 ± 0.03 1.88 ± 0.03
40	irreps ≤ 3	$\bigoplus_{i=0}^{3} \psi_i$	Shared norm-KeLU			0.01 ± 0.09 0.27 ± 0.05	1.07 ± 0.05 1.00 ± 0.05	1.88 ± 0.05 1.10 ± 0.05
41			ELU, gate	conv2triv	-	2.31 ± 0.06 2.22 ± 0.02	1.09 ± 0.03	1.10 ± 0.02 1.12 ± 0.02
42			ELU, snared gate	_		4.33 ± 0.06 2.22 ± 0.00	1.11 ± 0.03 1.04 ± 0.03	1.12 ± 0.04 1.05 ± 0.00
45			ELU, gate	norm	-	2.20 ± 0.09 2.20 ± 0.07	1.04 ± 0.04 1.01 ± 0.01	1.00 ± 0.06 1.03 ± 0.00
**	irranc — 0	ale -	ELU, shared gate		-	2.20±0.06	1.01 ± 0.03 5.91 ± 0.03	2.08±0.03
40	irrans < 1	$\psi_{0,0}$	ELU	-		0.40 ± 0.46 3.31 ± 0.47	3.21 ± 0.29 3.37 ± 0.49	3.95 ± 0.04
47	$irreps \le 1$ irreps < 3	$\psi_{0,0} \oplus \psi_{1,0} \oplus \omega \psi_{1,1}$ $\psi_{0,0} \oplus \psi_{1,0} \oplus \Phi^3 = 2\psi_{1,1}$			-	3.51 ± 0.17 3.42 ± 0.02	3.41 ± 0.18	3.00 ± 0.09 3.86 ± 0.09
40	$\operatorname{irreps} \leq 5$	$\psi_{0,0} \oplus \psi_{1,0} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{2} 2\psi_{1,i}$ $\psi_{0,0} \oplus \psi_{1,0} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{5} 2\psi_{1,i}$	ELU, norm-ReLU	O(2)-conv2tri	v -	3.59 ± 0.12	3.78±0.21	4 17 ± 0.15
40	$irreps \le 0$ irreps < 7	$\psi_{0,0} = \psi_{1,0} \oplus \psi_{1,0} \oplus \psi_{i=1} = 2\psi_{1,i}$			-	3.84 ± 0.13	3.90 ± 0.31	4.57 ± 0.15
50	Ind_irrens < 1	Ind $\psi_i^{SO(2)} \oplus \text{Ind } \psi_i^{SO(2)}$			_	2 72 + 0.05	2 70 ± 0.18	2.39 ± 0.07
·· O(2)	Ind irraps ≤ 1	Ind $\psi_0 \oplus \text{Ind } \psi_1$ Ind $\psi^{SO(2)} \oplus^3$ Ind $\psi^{SO(2)}$			-	2.72 ± 0.05 2.66 ± 0.07	2.70±0.11	2.09 ± 0.07 2.25 ± 0.07
51 U(2)	Ind irrans ≤ 5	Ind ψ_0 $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{i=1} \operatorname{Ind} \psi_i$ ψ_i $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{i=1} \operatorname{Ind} \psi_i$	ELU, Ind norm-ReLU	Ind-conv2triv	-	2.00 ± 0.07 2.71 ± 0.12	2.00 ± 0.12 2.84 ± 0.12	2.20 ± 0.06 2.30 ± 0.00
52	Ind irreps ≤ 5	Ind $\psi_0 = \prod_{i=1}^{i} \operatorname{Ind} \psi_i$ Ind $\psi_0^{SO(2)} = \prod_{i=1}^{i} \operatorname{Ind} \psi_i^{SO(2)}$			-	2.71±0.11 2.80±0.15	2.04±0.10	2.39 ± 0.09 2.25 ± 0.09
53	ma -irreps ≤ 7	$\operatorname{Im} \psi_0 = \bigoplus_{i=1} \operatorname{Im} \psi_i$		0(2)		2.80 ± 0.12 2.20 · · · · ·	2.80 ± 0.06	2.20 ± 0.08 2.28 ± 0.08
54	irreps ≤ 3	$\psi_{0,0} \oplus \psi_{1,0} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{3} 2\psi_{1,i}$	ELU, gate	O(2)-conv2trr	v -	2.59 ± 0.05 2.91 ± 0.05	2.30±0.07	2.20 ± 0.07 2.15 ± 0.07
55 57		-		Ind com/?triv	-	2.21 ± 0.09 2.12 ± 0.05	4.24 ± 0.06 2.00 ± 0.75	2.10 ± 0.03 2.05 ± 0.07
56	Ind-irreps ≤ 3	Ind $\psi_0^{SO(2)} \bigoplus_{i=1}^3 \text{Ind } \psi_i^{SO(2)}$	ELU, Ind gate	Ind norm	-	2.13 ± 0.04 1.06 ± 0.02	2.09 ± 0.05 1.05 ± 0.05	2.03 ± 0.05 1.85 ± 0.07
3.0				1001-00100	-	1.200 ± 0.06	1.361 ± 0.05	1.00 ± 0.07

MNIST Variations

General Program to implement G-equivariance: 3D voxel data

Axial rotational

symmetries in 3D

Table 1:	: Rotated	ModelNet10) (O(3) s	symmetry).	* indicates	wider	models	to fi	x the	comp	outational	cost
----------	-----------	------------	--------	-----	------------	-------------	-------	--------	-------	-------	------	------------	------

G	Description	Accuracy
{ <i>e</i> }	Conventional CNN	82.5 ± 1.4
SO(2)	Axial Symmetry	86.9 ± 1.9
$SO(2) \rtimes F \cong O(2)$	Dihedral Symmetry	87.5 ± 0.7
$SO(2) \rtimes M \cong O(2)$	Conical Symmetry	88.5 ± 0.8
$Inv \times SO(2)$	Cylindrical Symmetry	86.8 ± 0.7
$\text{Inv} \times \text{SO}(2) \rtimes \text{F}$	Full Cylindrical Symmetry	87.0 ± 1.0
0	Octahedral Symmetry (Winkels & Cohen, 2018)	89.7 ± 0.6
Ι	Icosahedral Symmetry	90.0 ± 0.6
Ι	Icosahedral Symmetry (finite orbits basis)	88.2 ± 1.0
SO(3)	Chiral (Tensor product) (Anderson et al., 2019)	86.3 ± 1.0
SO(3)	Chiral (Gated non-linearity)(Weiler et al., 2018b)	88.8 ± 1.2
SO(3)	Chiral (Regular, $ \mathcal{G} = 96$)	89.1 ± 1.2
SO(3)	Chiral (Regular, $ \mathcal{G} = 192$)*	89.4 ± 1.4
SO(3)	Chiral (Quotient $S^2 = SO(3)/SO(2), \mathcal{X} = 30$)	89.5 ± 1.0
O(3)	Achiral (Regular, $ \mathcal{G} = 120$)	89.2 ± 0.6
O(3)	Achiral (Regular, $ \mathcal{G} = 144$)*	89.4 ± 0.7
O(3)	Achiral (Quotient Inv $\times S^2 = O(3)/SO(2), \mathcal{X} = 60)$	88.6 ± 0.9



Table 2: ModelNet10 (O(2) symmetry)

G	Description	Accuracy
$\{e\}$	Conventional CNN	91.2 ± 0.5
SO(2)	Azimuthal Symmetry	91.9 ± 0.8
SU(3)	Chiral (Regular, $ \mathcal{G} = 72$)	89.8 ± 0.6
O(2)	A shirel (Decular 10)	92.3 ± 0.4
O(3)	Achiral (Regular, $ g = 120$)	89.9 ± 1.0
$C_2 \rtimes F$	Klein Group (dinedral symmetry)	91.0 ± 0.0
~ ~	VOXNet (Maturana & Scherer, 201	5) 92.0
$C_2 \rtimes F$	Klein Group (Worrall & Brostow, 2	2018) 94.2

Gabriele Cesa, Leon Lang, Maurice Weiler,

A Program to build E(n)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs,

International Conference on Representation Learning, 2022

Beyond fixed Steerable Basis





Learn *G*-equivariant MLP to parameterize *G*-steerable kernel $\kappa_{\theta}(g, x) = [(\rho_{in} \otimes \rho_{out})(g)]\kappa_{\theta}(x)$

Local Symmetries: Symmetries vary between features and scales

- Reflection symmetry in the class
- Rotational symmetry in the *local* patterns



source: MikeLynch, CC BY-SA 3.0



source: Tiffany Bailey, CC BY 2.0

Maurice Weiler* and Gabriele Cesa*. General E(2)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs, *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2019*

Group Restriction

- Model the loss of symmetries at larger scales by relaxing the equivariance constraint at different depths:
 - exploit more symmetries in the first layers
 - restrict later to the symmetries of your output



Maurice Weiler* and Gabriele Cesa*. General E(2)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs, *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2019*

Experiments on Natural Images

model	CIFAR-10	CIFAR-100
$\begin{array}{c cccc} wrn28/10 & [30] \\ wrn28/10 & D_1 D_1 D_1 \\ wrn28/10^* D_8 D_4 D_1 \\ wrn28/10 & C_8 C_4 C_1 \\ wrn28/10 & D_8 D_4 D_1 \\ wrn28/10 & D_8 D_4 D_4 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 3.87\\ 3.36\pm 0.08\\ 3.32\pm 0.10\\ 3.20\pm 0.04\\ 3.13\pm 0.17\\ 2.91\pm 0.13\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 18.80 \\ 17.97 \pm 0.11 \\ 17.42 \pm 0.38 \\ 16.47 \pm 0.22 \\ 16.76 \pm 0.40 \\ 16.22 \pm 0.31 \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c cccc} wrn28/10 & [31] & AA \\ wrn28/10* & D_8 & D_4 & D_1 & AA \\ wrn28/10 & D_8 & D_4 & D_1 & AA \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.6 \ \pm 0.1 \\ 2.39 \pm 0.12 \\ 2.05 \pm 0.03 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 17.1 \ \pm 0.3 \\ 15.55 \pm 0.13 \\ 14.30 \pm 0.09 \end{array}$

AA = Auto Augment

model	group	#params	test error (%)
wrn16/8 [32]	-	11M	$12.74 {\pm} 0.23$
wrn16/8*	$D_1D_1D_1$	5M	$11.05 {\pm} 0.45$
wrn16/8	$D_1D_1D_1$	10M	$11.17{\pm}0.60$
wrn16/8*	$D_8D_4D_1$	4.2M	$10.57 {\pm} 0.70$
wrn16/8	$D_8D_4D_1$	12M	$9.80 {\pm} 0.40$

STL - 10



Maurice Weiler* and Gabriele Cesa*. General E(2)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs, *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2019*

Imperfect or Unknown symmetries

- Group Restriction : layer adapted to the symmetries manifested in the scale of its field of view
 - Still requires knowledge about these symmetries
- Can we *learn* the level of equivariance from data?



Finzi, M., Benton, G., and Wilson, A. G. Residual pathway priors for soft equivariance constraints. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) 2021.* van der Ouderaa, T., Romero, D. W., and van der Wilk, M. Relaxing equivariance constraints with non-stationary continuous filters. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2022

Wang, R., Walters, R., and Yu, R. Approximately equivariant networks for imperfectly symmetric dynamics. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), 2022 Romero, D. W. and Lohit, S. Learning partial equivariances from data. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2022 Agenda

From Group Convolution to Steerable Filters

Steerable Fields and Representation Theory

Steerable CNNs

Hard Priors: solving the exact kernel constraint

Soft Priors: learnable kernel constraint

Learnable Soft Prior

Learn *probability distribution* λ over a large group G

- uniform: indicates equivariance over full group *G*
- Supported on subgroup $H \subset G$: indicates equivariance over full group G
- Low values outside subgroup $H \subset G$: indicates "soft / relaxed prior"



Learnable steerability constraint: Reynolds Operator

• Linear projection Π : space of *unconstrained kernels* \mapsto space of *equivariant kernels*

$$K': \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times d_{in}} \qquad \longmapsto \qquad K = \Pi[K']: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times d_{in}}$$

$$K(x) = \rho_{out}(g) K(g^{-1}.x) \rho_{in}(g)^{T}$$
$$\Pi[K'](x) = \int_{G} \rho_{out}(g) K'(g^{-1}.x) \rho_{in}(g)^{T} dg$$

Learnable steerability constraint: Reynolds Operator

• Linear projection Π : space of *unconstrained kernels* \mapsto space of *equivariant kernels*

$$K': \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times d_{in}} \qquad \longmapsto \qquad K = \prod_{\lambda} [K']: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{d_{out} \times d_{in}}$$



Learnable steerability constraint: Repeat Previous Derivations

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi_{\lambda}[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\psi_{l} \otimes \psi_{J})(g)\kappa'(g^{-1}.x)\lambda(g)dg$$
$$= \sum_{j,k} unvec[*] Y_{j}^{k}(x)$$
$$Q_{jl}^{T} \left(\bigoplus_{i} \bigoplus_{r}^{[i(jl)]} \left[\int_{G} \psi_{i}(g)\lambda(g) dg \right] \right) Q_{jl} vec(W_{j,k})$$
Learnable steerability constraint: Recall Fourier Transform

• The matrix coefficients of the *irreducible representations* form an *orthogonal basis*

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi_{\lambda}[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\psi_{l} \otimes \psi_{j})(g)\kappa'(g^{-1}.x)\lambda(g)dg$$
$$= \sum_{j,k} unvec[] Y_{j}^{k}(x)$$
$$Q_{jlj}^{T} \left(\bigoplus_{i} \bigoplus_{r}^{[i(jlj)]} \left[\int_{G} \psi_{i}(g)\lambda(g) dg \right] \right) Q_{jlj} vec(W_{j,k})$$

Peter-Weyl Theorem Generalized Fourier Transform

Learnable steerability constraint: Recall Fourier Transform

• The matrix coefficients of the *irreducible representations* form an *orthogonal basis*

$$\kappa(x) = \Pi_{\lambda}[\kappa'](x) = \int_{G} (\psi_{l} \otimes \psi_{J})(g)\kappa'(g^{-1}.x)\lambda(g)dg$$
$$= \sum_{j,k} unvec[] Y_{j}^{k}(x)$$
$$Q_{jlJ}^{T} \left(\bigoplus_{i} \bigoplus_{r}^{[i(jlJ)]} \frac{\hat{\lambda}(\psi_{i})}{\sqrt{d_{i}}}\right)Q_{jlJ} vec(W_{j,k})$$

Peter-Weyl Theorem Generalized Fourier Transform

Learnable steerability constraint: Recall Fourier Transform

• The matrix coefficients of the *irreducible representations* form an *orthogonal basis*

Side to Side comparison



Side to Side comparison: Simple MLP Setting





Ur(O) Ciko

Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. International Conference on Machine Learning. 2024

Learnable steerability constraint: Implementation Details

- Everything is *differentiable* : can directly backpropagate to $\hat{\lambda}(\psi_i)$
- Normalise λ to a PDF:

$$\hat{\lambda} = FT\left(\operatorname{softmax}\left(IFT(\hat{\lambda}')\right)\right)$$

 $\widehat{\lambda'}$ is the Fourier Transform of the log-likelihood function

• Initialize λ to uniform distribution

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_i) = \begin{cases} 1, & i = 0\\ \mathbf{0}_{d_i \times d_i}, & i \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

• Tunable band-limit L on $\hat{\lambda}$ to regularise the likelihood and reduce parameters:



Learnable steerability constraint: Implementation Details

Regularize subsequent layers with KL-divergence:



Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. International Conference on Machine Learning. 2024

• Rectangular images containing 2 digits, independently transformed



(c) Local vs global 90 degree rotation.

(d) Local vs global 180 degree rotation.





37

73

Rectangular images containing 2 digits, independently transformed

Network	Partial	Symmetries for individual digits					
Group	Equivariance	C_1	C_4	SO(2)	D_1	D_4	O(2)
CNN	N/A	0.962 (0.002)	0.868 (0.011)	<u>0.807</u> (0.007)	<u>0.919</u> (0.006)	0.711 (0.009)	0.649 (0.019)
C_4	None Restriction RPP Ours	$\begin{array}{c} 0.933 \ (0.002) \\ \underline{0.954} \ (0.003) \\ 0.937 \ (0.006) \\ 0.947 \ (0.006) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.484 \ (0.008) \\ 0.911 \ (0.006) \\ 0.901 \ (0.012) \\ \underline{0.916} \ (0.005) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.459 \ (0.007) \\ 0.877 \ (0.009) \\ 0.867 \ (0.025) \\ \underline{0.891} \ (0.006) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.893 \ (0.005) \\ \underline{0.928} \ (0.006) \\ 0.899 \ (0.014) \\ 0.923 \ (0.007) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.427 \ (0.008) \\ 0.827 \ (0.013) \\ 0.821 \ (0.023) \\ \underline{0.848} \ (0.007) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.405 \ (0.008) \\ 0.776 \ (0.018) \\ 0.772 \ (0.009) \\ \underline{0.795} \ (0.011) \end{array}$
D_4	None Restriction RPP Ours	$\begin{array}{c} 0.895 \ (0.005) \\ \underline{0.953} \ (0.004) \\ 0.934 \ (0.007) \\ 0.949 \ (0.005) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.439 \ (0.010) \\ 0.912 \ (0.007) \\ 0.888 \ (0.014) \\ \hline \textbf{0.922} \ (0.007) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.396 \ (0.009) \\ \underline{0.887} \ (0.003) \\ 0.867 \ (0.014) \\ 0.885 \ (0.012) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.473 \ (0.010) \\ \underline{0.930} \ (0.007) \\ 0.895 \ (0.007) \\ 0.921 \ (0.008) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.431 \ (0.010) \\ 0.827 \ (0.007) \\ 0.821 \ (0.020) \\ \underline{0.848} \ (0.011) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.394 \ (0.008) \\ 0.773 \ (0.009) \\ 0.775 \ (0.013) \\ \underline{0.801} \ (0.009) \end{array}$
SO(2)	None Restriction RPP Ours	$\begin{array}{c} 0.936 \ (0.005) \\ 0.949 \ (0.002) \\ 0.935 \ (0.008) \\ \underline{0.953} \ (0.004) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.485\ (0.010)\\ 0.911\ (0.010)\\ 0.890\ (0.005)\\ \hline \textbf{0.922}\ (0.005) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.474 \ (0.016) \\ 0.893 \ (0.009) \\ 0.870 \ (0.011) \\ \underline{0.901} \ (0.005) \end{array}$	0.890 (0.006) 0.928 (0.003) 0.899 (0.009) <u>0.932</u> (0.005)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.430 \ (0.010) \\ 0.841 \ (0.012) \\ 0.821 \ (0.022) \\ \hline \textbf{0.863} \ (0.009) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.403 \ (0.021) \\ 0.796 \ (0.011) \\ 0.779 \ (0.021) \\ \hline \textbf{0.823} \ (0.005) \end{array}$
O(2)	None Restriction RPP Ours	$\begin{array}{c} 0.881 \ (0.005) \\ 0.953 \ (0.005) \\ 0.931 \ (0.005) \\ \hline 0.958 \ (0.003) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.415 \ (0.008) \\ 0.914 \ (0.005) \\ 0.891 \ (0.003) \\ \underline{0.919} \ (0.006) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.391 \ (0.012) \\ \underline{0.894} \ (0.005) \\ 0.861 \ (0.013) \\ \underline{0.894} \ (0.004) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.461 \ (0.012) \\ \underline{0.928} \ (0.005) \\ 0.891 \ (0.004) \\ 0.927 \ (0.004) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.424 \ (0.009) \\ 0.845 \ (0.011) \\ 0.824 \ (0.009) \\ \underline{0.859} \ (0.011) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.399 \ (0.014) \\ 0.799 \ (0.008) \\ 0.772 \ (0.019) \\ \underline{0.819} \ (0.010) \end{array}$

37

Maurice Weiler* and Gabriele Cesa*. General E(2)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs, *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2019* Finzi, M., Benton, G., and Wilson, A. G. Residual pathway priors for soft equivariance constraints. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) 2021.* Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Machine Learning. 2024*

73

Evaluation on MedMNIST3D dataset

• 3D voxel data

Network Group	Partial Equivariance	Nodule	Synapse	Organ
CNN	N/A	0.873 (0.005)	$\underline{0.716}$ (0.008)	$\underline{0.920} \ (0.003)$
SO(3)	None RPP Ours	$\begin{array}{c} \underline{\textbf{0.873}} \\ 0.801 \ (0.003) \\ 0.871 \ (0.001) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.738 \ (0.009) \\ 0.695 \ (0.037) \\ \hline \textbf{0.770} \ (0.030) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.607 \ (0.006) \\ \underline{0.936} \ (0.002) \\ 0.902 \ (0.006) \end{array}$
O(3)	None RPP Ours	$\begin{array}{c} 0.868 \ (0.009) \\ 0.810 \ (0.013) \\ \hline \textbf{0.873} \ (0.008) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.743 \ (0.004) \\ 0.722 \ (0.023) \\ \underline{0.769} \ (0.005) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.592 \ (0.008) \\ \underline{0.940} \ (0.006) \\ 0.905 \ (0.004) \end{array}$

Maurice Weiler* and Gabriele Cesa*. General E(2)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs, *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2019* Finzi, M., Benton, G., and Wilson, A. G. Residual pathway priors for soft equivariance constraints. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) 2021.* Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Machine Learning. 2024*

Evaluation on Smoke and JetFlow simulations

• 2D frames from simulation

		Smoke			JetFlow	
Model	Future	Domain	Params (M)	Future	Domain	Params (k)
MLP	1.38 (0.06)	1.34 (0.03)	8.33*	-	-	510*
CNN	1.21 (0.01)	1.10 (0.05)	0.25*	-	-	10*
e2cnn	1.05 (0.06)	0.76 (0.02)	0.62*	0.21 (0.02)	0.27 (0.03)	21*
RPP	0.96 (0.10)	0.82 (0.01)	4.36*	0.16* (0.01)	0.19* (0.01)	145*
Combo	1.07 (0.00)	0.82 (0.02)	0.53*	-	-	19*
CLCNN	0.96 (0.05)	0.84 (0.10)	-	-	-	-
Lift	0.82 (0.01)	0.73 (0.02)	3.32*	0.18 (0.02)	0.21 (0.04)	479*
RGroup	0.82 (0.01)	0.73 (0.02)	1.88*	-	-	63*
RSteer	0.80 (0.00)	0.67 (0.01)	5.60*	0.17 (0.01)	0.16 (0.01)	185*
Ours	0.77 (0.01)	0.57 (0.00)	3.12	0.15 (0.00)	0.17 (0.01)	105

Maurice Weiler* and Gabriele Cesa*. General E(2)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs, *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2019* Finzi, M., Benton, G., and Wilson, A. G. Residual pathway priors for soft equivariance constraints. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) 2021. Wang, R., Walters, R., and Yu, R. Approximately equivariant networks for imperfectly symmetric dynamics. International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), 2022* Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Machine Learning. 2024*

Conclusion

- Complete theoretical description of the space of *G*-steerable filters
 - For any compact G and any transformation laws ho_{in} , ho_{out}
- Algorithm to explicitly construct the steerable convolution layers <u>github.com/QUVA-Lab/escnn</u>



- Effective way to relax hard inductive bias / learn it
 - Symmetries vary between features and scales.
 - Overconstraining leads to performance reductions.
 - CNN layers can be fine-tuned with group restrictions.

Maurice Weiler* and Gabriele Cesa*. General E(2)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs, *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2019* Gabriele Cesa, Leon Lang, Maurice Weiler, A Program to build E(n)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs, *International Conference on Representation Learning, 2022* Maksim Zhdanov, Nico Hoffmann, Gabriele Cesa, Implicit Convolutional Kernels for Steerable CNNs. *Neural Information Processing Systems, 2023* Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. *International Conference on Machine Learning, 2024*

Thank you

Nothing in these materials is an offer to sell any of the components or devices referenced herein.

© Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. and/or its affiliated companies. All Rights Reserved.

Qualcomm and Snapdragon are trademarks or registered trademarks of Qualcomm Incorporated. Other products and brand names may be trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners.

References in this presentation to "Qualcomm" may mean Qualcomm Incorporated, Qualcomm Technologies, Inc., and/or other subsidiaries or business units within the Qualcomm corporate structure, as applicable. Qualcomm Incorporated includes ourlicensing business, QTL, and the vast majority of our patent portfolio. Qualcomm Technologies, Inc., as ubsidiary of Qualcomm Incorporated, operates, along with its subsidiaries, substantially all of our engineering, research and development functions, and substantially all of ourproducts and services businesses, including our QCT semiconductor business.

Snapdragon and Qualcomm branded products are products of Qualcomm Technologies, Inc. and/or its subsidiaries. Qualcomm patented technologies are licensed by Qualcomm Incorporated.

Side to Side comparison: Simple MLP Setting



Lars Veefkind and Gabriele Cesa. A Probabilistic Approach to Learning the Degree of Equivariance in Steerable CNNs. International Conference on Machine Learning. 2024

Agenda

Other experiments

• Rectangular images containing 2 digits, independently transformed



37

(a) CNN (b) O(2) SCNN (c) Our O(2) PSCNN

Figure 2. Confusion matrices for DDMNIST with O(2) symmetries. Labelled 0-99 from top to bottom and left to right.

73

Effect of Band-Limiting on Double-MNIST 37

• Rectangular images containing 2 digits, independently transformed



Figure 4. Likelihoods and errors of the fifth O(2) PSCNN layer trained on SO(2) DDMNIST under various bandlimits L.

		Symmetries				
Network Group	L	SO(2)	<i>O</i> (2)			
	None	0.474 (0.016)	0.403(0.021)			
$GO(\mathbf{a})$	1	0.883(0.007)	0.794 (0.011)			
SO(2)	2	0.901(0.005)	0.823 (0.005)			
	3	0.908 (0.006)	$0.821\ (0.002)$			
	4	0.904(0.004)	0.820(0.013)			
	None	0.391 (0.012)	0.399(0.014)			
	0	0.469(0.010)	0.402(0.003)			
O(2)	1	0.894 (0.011)	0.780(0.009)			
	2	0.894 (0.004)	0.819 (0.010)			
	3	0.889(0.013)	0.817(0.007)			
	4	0.891 (0.006)	0.819 (0.018)			

Table 21. Double MNIST test accuracies using various levels of bandlimiting for our SO(2) and O(2) P-SCNNs. For each symmetry, the highest accuracy is **bold**, and the highest for each network group within this type of symmetry is <u>underlined</u>. Standard deviations over 5 runs are denoted in parentheses.

73

Effect of Bandlimiting on Smoke dataset

		RM	ISE	Params (M) using	Hypothetical params (M)	
Model	L	Future Domain		default 3×3 kernels	using 5×5 kernels	
RPP	-	0.81 (0.01)	0.70 (0.04)	6.43	17.24	
RSteer	-	0.78 (0.01)	0.58 (0.00)	5.57	27.75	
Ours	1	0.85 (0.01)	0.63 (0.00)	2.80	5.05	
	2	0.78 (0.01)	0.58 (0.02)	4.30	7.84	
	4	0.79 (0.02)	0.61 (0.03)	5.95	10.83	
	6	0.78 (0.01)	0.59 (0.03)	6.36	11.65	

Table 23. Smoke RMSE scores and parameter counts (in millions, M) comparing SO(2) equivariant RSteer with our SO(2)-PSCNN using various levels of band-limiting. Note that a band-limit of L = 6 equates to performing no band-limiting at all. Standard deviations over 5 runs are denoted in parentheses.

Experiments with more effective architectures

Network Group	Partial Equivariance	L	OrganMNIST3D		Double MNIST with $O(2)$ Symmetries		
			FourierELU	Gated	FourierELU	Gated	
CNN	N/A	N/A	<u>0.921</u> (0.003)		$\underline{0.649}$ (0.019)		
SO(n)	None RPP	N/A N/A	$\begin{array}{c} 0.879 \ (0.007) \\ 0.930 \ (0.011) \end{array}$	$0.607 (0.006) \\ 0.936 (0.002)$	$0.842 (0.007) \\ 0.617 (0.043)$	$0.403 (0.021) \\ 0.779 (0.021)$	
	Ours	2 3 4	0.935 (0.003) 0.932 (0.003) 0.941 (0.007)	0.902 (0.006) 0.902 (0.002) 0.896 (0.003)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.852 \ (0.009) \\ 0.853 \ (0.016) \\ \underline{0.855} \ (0.004) \end{array}$	0.823 (0.005) 0.821 (0.002) 0.820 (0.013)	
O(n)	None RPP	N/A N/A	$\begin{array}{c} 0.821 \ (0.005) \\ \underline{0.936} \ (0.004) \end{array}$	$\frac{0.592}{0.940} (0.008)$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.860 \; (0.005) \\ 0.677 \; (0.037) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.399 \; (0.014) \\ 0.772 \; (0.019) \end{array}$	
	Ours	2 3 4	$\begin{array}{c} 0.911 \ (0.007) \\ 0.920 \ (0.008) \\ 0.911 \ (0.003) \end{array}$	0.905 (0.004) - -	0.869 (0.005) 0.885 (0.003) 0.876 (0.006)	$\begin{array}{c} \underline{0.819} \\ 0.817 \\ (0.007) \\ \underline{0.819} \\ (0.018) \end{array}$	

Table 24. Test accuracies on OrganMNIST3D and DoubleMNIST comparing the performance of our baseline configurations (Gated) with the structurally non-invariant configurations using a Fourier based non-linearity. For each column, **bold** indicates the highest accuracy and underline denotes the highest accuracy for the given network group. Standard deviations over 5 runs are denoted in parentheses.

Agenda

Groups

Group Conv

Non-Linearities

Running examples

Discrete planar translations: $(\mathbb{Z}^2, +)$

Discrete planar rotations: C_n

Symmetries of squared grid: $p4 = (\mathbb{Z}^2, +) \rtimes C_4$



 $p4 = (\mathbb{Z}^2, +) \rtimes C_4$



Running examples

Discrete planar translations: $(\mathbb{Z}^2, +)$

Discrete planar rotations *and mirroring* : *D_n*

Symmetries of squared grid: $p4m = (\mathbb{Z}^2, +) \rtimes D_4$



 $p4m = (\mathbb{Z}^2, +) \rtimes D_4$



Generalize Convolution

Group cross-correlation:



















Equivariant Non-Linearities

- Intermediate feature $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^d$
- Transforms under representation of $G \ \rho: G \to \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ $[g.f](x) = \rho(g)f(g^{-1}x)$
- We can NOT always use point-wise non-linearities (e.g ReLU)



Equivariant Non-Linearities: Fourier Transform based

- Imitate a GCNN
- Choose a band-limited subset of irreps $\{\rho_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \hat{G}$
- A feature vector $f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents a bandlimited signal in $L^2(G)$
- Apply point-wise non-linearity σ (e.g. ReLU) by:
 - Sampling the signal f(x) on a finite subset $G \subset G$
 - Applying σ on each sample
 - Reconstruct a band-limited signal from the samples



Equivariant Non-Linearities: Fourier Transform based

- Imitate a GCNN
- Choose a band-limited subset of irreps $\{\rho_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \hat{G}$
- A feature vector $f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents a bandlimited signal in $L^2(G)$
- Apply point-wise non-linearity σ (e.g. ReLU) by:
 - Sampling the signal f(x) on a finite subset $G \subset G$ (discrete Inverse Fourier Transform)
 - Applying σ on each sample
 - Reconstruct a band-limited signal from the samples (discrete Fourier Transform)

• Band-limit + sufficient samples to control *reconstruction error*

Equivariant Non-Linearities: Fourier Transform based

- Imitate a GCNN
- Choose a band-limited subset of irreps $\{\rho_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \hat{G}$
- A feature vector $f(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents a bandlimited signal in $L^2(G)$
- Apply point-wise non-linearity σ (e.g. ReLU) by:
 - Sampling the signal f(x) on a finite subset $G \subset G$ (discrete Inverse Fourier Transform)
 - Applying σ on each sample
 - Reconstruct a band-limited signal from the samples
 (discrete Fourier Transform)

Can also consider functions on homogeneous space X rather than G for reduced complexity.
 Recall Spherical CNNs

Convolution and Message Passing



$$[\kappa \star f](y) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \kappa(x - y) f(x)$$
Convolution and Message Passing



$$[\kappa \star f](y) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \kappa(x - y) f(x)$$

$$[\kappa \star f](i) = \sum_{j \in N_i} \kappa (x_i - x_j) f_j$$

Nathaniel Thomas, Tess Smidt, Steven Kearnes, Lusann Yang, Li Li, Kai Kohlhoff, and Patrick Riley. Tensor field networks: Rotation-and translation-equivariant neural networks for 3d point clouds. (2018)